



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,991	08/09/2001	Gopal N. Iyer	60027.0022US01	4754
39262	7590	11/15/2005	EXAMINER	
BELLSOUTH CORPORATION P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			HANNE, SARA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/925,991	Applicant(s) IYER, GOPAL N.	
	Examiner Sara M. Hanne	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 August 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment received on August 31, 2005.

Examiner herein notes Claims 1-9 and 11-20 pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3 and 7 contain the trademark/trade name "Ericsson". Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe a company and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 12-13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munguia et al., US Patent 6381644, hereinafter Munguia, and further in view of Denenberg et al., US Patent 6859649, hereinafter Denenberg.

As in Claims 1, 8, 12 and 19, Munguia teaches a computer implemented method and computer-readable medium with computer-readable instructions for receiving form name input (Fig. 8, Fig 9a) corresponding to a type of cell site data stored on a plurality of forms in the cellular site information database, wherein the forms include a plurality of fields (), in response to receiving form name input, displaying on a display device a form on which the data corresponding to the received form name input is stored (Fig 9b) and receiving a key field on the displayed form which corresponds to a cellular site ("user ID" field 439, 532), then generating queries to retrieve the type of cell site data (search criteria) corresponding to the form name input for the cellular site corresponding to the received value and the identified cellular site from the database (Column 15, line 25 et seq.), and sending the queries to the database and receiving the type of cell site data corresponding to the form name input for the cellular site corresponding to the received value from the cellular site information database and displaying this data (Column 18, lines 31-39) on a displayed form, and receiving user input editing the data in at least one of the fields, generating and sending commands corresponding to user input to edit cellular site data in the information database (Figure 9g and corresponding text, Column 16, line 26 et seq.). While Munguia teaches identifying a form name input

Art Unit: 2179

corresponding to cell site data and receiving a value in one of the blank fields corresponding to a cellular site, they fail to show the first displaying a blank form to receive the value corresponding to a cellular site and then retrieving the cell site data as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Denenberg teaches a cellular information database accessing similar to that of Munguia. In addition, Denenberg further teaches first displaying the blank page, then entering a value indicating the cellular site database, and then populating the fields with the appropriate form field data corresponding to the cellular site indicated (Col. 6, lines 8-19 and lines 41 et seq.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Munguia and Denenberg before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the database accessing system by form name input and cellular site value indication taught by Munguia to include the display of a blank form first and subsequent indication of cellular site value used to populate the form of Denenberg, in order to obtain a step by step system of accessing form data corresponding to a particular cell cite. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a more system facilitated user interface would have been obtained, as taught by Denenberg.

As in Claim 2, Munguia teaches the key field is input by a user (Figure 9 and corresponding text).

As in Claims 3 and 7, Munguia, discloses separating the information selected from the rest of the document. Munguia, fails to teach and Ericsson database and Operation supports sytem as recited in the claims. Within the field of the invention, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an Ericsson database and

Operation Support system with the invention since the Assignee for the Munguia Patent is MCI WorldCom, a communications company. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a query interface for use in a specific database system would have been obtained.

As in Claims 5-6, it is inherently included in Munguia for the queries to be several line commands executed by a command handler application with interfaces in conjunction with a cellular site information database. A command handler application is necessary to handle user-inputted commands, which are taught by Munguia (requests made by the mobile subscriber, See also Claim 1 rejection *supra*).

As in Claim 9, Munguia teaches the form name input is a channel (Figure 9g and corresponding text)

As in Claim 13, Munguia teaches the update application program module operative to transmit commands to the cellular processor (Fig. 9g and corresponding text, Column 16, line 26 et seq.).

5. Claims 4 and 11, 14-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munguia, US Patent 6381644, and Denenberg, US Patent 6859649 and further in view of Cambray et al., US Patent 5577112.

Munguia and Denenberg teach a method for querying cellular site information databases according to specified key field form name input and editing of this data as in Claims 1, 12 and 19. While Munguia and Denenberg teaches cellular site information database querying and editing, they fail to show the use of either SQL commands

Art Unit: 2179

(specifically update, review, insert and delete), as recited in Claims 4, 11, 14-18 and 20, or a command handler application to execute commands in conjunction with the cellular site database as recited in claims 5-6. In the same field of the invention, Cambray et al. teaches a telecommunication management system similar to that of Munguia and Denenberg. In addition, Cambray et al. further teaches the queries are completed using SQL commands (via an interactive query language such as by standard query language (SQL) commands.", Column 3, lines 53-55) as in Claims 4, 11, 14, 20, specifically editing commands such as update (modify), review (list), insert and delete (Column 6, lines 28-32) as in claims 15-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Munguia and Denenberg and Cambray et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the querying method using form name input taught by Munguia and Denenberg to include the SQL commands of Cambray et al., in order to obtain a query system implemented using a structured query language. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because an efficient query system of cellular site databases would have been obtained, as taught by Cambray et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 11-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar user interfaces for querying and editing cellular site information databases.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara M. Hanne whose telephone number is (571) 272-4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WEILUN LO can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smh

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER